

REMARKS

In the Office action, claims 1, 3, 21, 22 and 26 were rejected as unpatentable over Jahn in view of admitted prior art; claims 1-4, 12, 14, 15, 21-22 and 26 were rejected as being unpatentable over Friel in view of Jahn and admitted prior art; claims 2, 4, 13, 16 and 17 were rejected as being unpatentable over Jahn in view of Corrigan and admitted prior art; and claims 4, 13, 16, 17 and 23-25 were rejected as being unpatentable over Friel in view of Corrigan.

As a preliminary matter, Applicants previously noted in earlier responses that the Office actions did not respond to specific arguments presented. The only comment in the present Office action is the statement that Applicants argued non-claimed features, notably selecting among different pumps and guns. With all due respect, the claims plainly recite that the user makes a gun selection and a pump selection from first and second pumps and first and second guns. The words first and second clearly connote difference otherwise there is no selection.

The present invention is directed to allowing a remote user to configure and order a material application system by selecting components of the system that are offered by a manufacturer. This is significantly different from the cited art that merely relates to allowing a user to select parameters, particularly of a virtual system that merely simulates an application system for purposes clearly different than configuring and ordering the material application system. Independent claims 1 and 23 have been amended to more distinctly point out the claimed difference. The amended claims are directed to the concept of a user being able to configure a material application system based on material application components provided by a manufacturer. None of the references of record involve a configuration program for material application system components provided by the manufacturer, specifically from a site from which the material application components may be ordered, purchased or manufactured. Further as to claim 23, Applicants respectfully disagree with the characterization of the teachings of Corrigan in the Office action. Corrigan indeed has a database of color match, but this can in no way suggest the claimed case studies that specifically recite features of actual operational systems, including equipment suppliers and oven and conveyor suppliers.


Applicants traverse the rejections of the dependent claims but detailed comment will be

Serial No.: 09/921,465
Examiner: G. Koch
Art Unit: 1734
Date: June 13, 2005
Page 7 of 7

deferred pending further examination of the independent claims. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 13, 2005

By: 
Leonard L. Lewis
Reg. No. 31,176
(216) 622-8683